

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-5 are pending and rejected. Applicants, respectfully, traverse the rejection and submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are in condition for allowance.

## REJECTION

### Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of claims 1-5

The Office rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,653,234 issued to Kim et al. (hereon after "Kim") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,735,797 issued to Muzilla et al. (hereon after "Muzilla") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,659 issued to Jensen et al. (hereon after "Jensen").

In the Office Action, the Office insinuated that the combination of *Kim*, *Muzilla* and *Jensen* discloses all the elements recited in claim 1. In support of the rejection, the Office indicated that "[i]t would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kim's filtered image of fig. 2, num 114 of obtaining a velocity measure with Muzilla's teaching of obtaining a velocity measure represented in Muzilla in fig. 9 as VELDATA based on interpolating in fig. 9, num 124A, because Muzilla's teaching provide a visual display of flow data such as velocity instead of just obtaining velocity as done in Kim." *Office Action*, at page 5. In addition, the Office indicated that "[i]t would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kim's typically autocorrelation with Jensen's teaching of traditional autocorrelation with the new autocorrelation, because Jensen's new autocorrelation is 'new and improved'." *Id.*, pages 5-6. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite a combination of elements directed to a method of image filtering that includes “computing a modified auto-correlation in a horizontal direction for each pixel in an image, wherein the modified autocorrelation coefficient is computed utilizing  $\rho = R_{xx}(1)/(R_{xx}(0)+\delta)$ ....”

*Kim* discloses an “apparatus and method for removing noise from a signal... by filtering S9x) through a low pass filter having an adjustable pass band....” *Kim*, at Abstract. *Mozilla*, on the other hand, discloses an “ultrasound imaging system for displaying edge-enhancement topographic flow power data surrounding by B-mode anatomic data without masking out any significant edge-enhanced topographic flow power data and without displaying any significant flow power background noise.” *Mozilla*, at Abstract. Conversely, *Jensen* discloses a method and apparatus for “estimating the velocity vector of remotely sensed object or group of objects using wither ultrasound or electromagnetic radiation.” *Jensen*, at Abstract.

It is Applicant’s opinion that neither *Kim*, *Mozilla* nor *Jensen* suggest or show a motivation for modifying the reference or to combine the reference teachings. In addition, it is Applicants’ opinion that there is no evidence in either prior art that shows a “reasonable expectation of success” in combining the references. Thus, it is Applicant’s belief that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been provided.

As a result, Applicants submit that, at the time Applicant’s invention was made, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify *Kim*’s teaching with the teaching of *Mozilla* or *Jensen*. To the contrary, *Kim* discloses a method and apparatus to remove noise from a signal, *Mozilla* discloses an “ultrasound imaging system”, while *Jensen* discloses a method “for estimating the velocity vector of a remotely sensed object or group of objects.” Therefore, Applicants submit that *Kim*, *Mozilla* and *Jensen*, alone and in combination, do not teach or suggest all the elements recited in claim 1.

*Jensen I*, *Jensen II*, *Kim II* (US patent 5,544658) and *Hall* where mentioned with respect to dependent claims 2-5. Since claims 2-5 depend from amended claim 1 and include all the limitation of amended claim 1, Applicants submit that *Kim*, *Mozilla*, *Jensen I*, *Jensen II*, *Kim II* and *Hall*, alone and in combination, do not teach all the elements of claim 1-5, Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1-5 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-5.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-0995 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 30, 2008

By: /Mirna Abyad/  
MIRNA ABYAD  
Registration No. 58,615  
Texas Instruments  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
Telephone: (972) 917-4365